

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 29, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 remain in this application, where claims 24-25 have been added by the present amendment. Claims 1 and 19-20 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over WO 02/37411 (Liess) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,677 (Printzis) and WO 03/098527 (Duijve). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are patentable over Liess, Printzis and Duijve for at least the following reasons.

At the outset, it is respectfully submitted that Duijve is not prior art to the present application. The present application has an effective filing date of August 29, 2002, which is before the Duijve publication date of November 27, 2003. Further, the effective date of Duijve is, at best, its PCT filing date of May 13, 2003 (and not its foreign priority claim date of May 17, 2002).

That is, Duijve was PCT filed and published after the effective filing date of the present application. As the effective filing date of the present application of August 29, 2002 is before the Duijve PCT filing date of May 13, 2003, Duijve is not available as prior art with regard to the present application.

Further, as correctly noted on page 4 of the Office Action, Liess and Printzis do not disclose or suggest "wherein each key ... is associated with only a single path of said at least two paths," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 19-20.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 19-20 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-18 and 21-25 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 19-20 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to

submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
April 23, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101